



## TRAFFIC SAFETY AND PARKING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, December 2, 2009 - 7:00 pm

San Bruno City Hall  
567 El Camino Real  
San Bruno, CA 94066

## MINUTES

### 1. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS -

#### A. ROLL CALL

<u>TSPC Members:</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
(Chair) Mark Howard	X	
Eric Wood (Vice-Chair)	X	
Tom Hamilton	X	
Doris Maez	X	
Sol Weiner	X	

#### Staff in Attendance:

Steve Davis, Public Works Department  
Klara Fabry, Public Works Department  
Matt Campi, Police Department

#### Public in Attendance Total: 1

Sol Weiner announced his retirement from the Committee. Klara Fabry thanked Sol for his thirteen years of service to the Traffic Safety and Parking Committee and presented him with a certificate of appreciation.

### 2. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Mark Howard recommended hearing Item 4 first to address the member of the public present.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Doris Maez stated on page 3, paragraph 6, "on-site parking that's accessible to a dwelling entrance or a disabled person" should read "on-site parking that's accessible to a dwelling entrance for a disabled person" and page 4, paragraph 11, "Steve Davis confirmed the total timeline could be show" should read "Steve Davis confirmed the total timeline could be shown". Corrections noted. Approval of the November 4, 2009 meeting minutes made by Sol Weiner, second by Doris Maez. (M/Weiner, S/Maez: 5-0-0) Approved.

### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Oscar Demirjian, 476 Hawthorne Avenue, stated every morning when he tries to turn left onto Jenevein from Hawthorne Avenue, it is nearly impossible because of the high traffic flow. Visibility is very difficult also. He has met with Steve Davis at the location and reviewed the problem with him. Mark Howard explained that the item cannot be heard at tonight's meeting because it must be placed on the agenda. Mark offered to place it on January's agenda and Steve Davis concurred. Mr. Demirjian stated he would not be able to attend the January 6 meeting, so Mark Howard recommended either sending a representative for the January meeting or placing it on the agenda for the February meeting. Steve Davis stated it could be placed on the January meeting agenda and continued to the February meeting if necessary.

## **5. REGULAR BUSINESS**

- A. Establishment of Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Parking Restrictions: Red Curb/No Parking Zone, Yellow Curb/Loading Zone, Blue Curb/Disabled Parking, Green Curb/20-Minute Parking Zone, Restricted Tall Vehicle Parking Zone, Auto Repair District/12-Hour Parking Zone – Continued from August 2009 Meeting (Continued from November 4, 2009)

Steve Davis stated this item has been carried over from the last meeting. There are two revised documents attached based on the comments from last month's meeting. Document one incorporates the policy and criteria for long term and short term duration parking and some additional specific categories. Document two is a flow chart that incorporates the revised process that is being proposed. This is being presented to review for accuracy.

In the flow chart, the first item is the application submittal and payment of the application fee. Then City staff would review the request according to the established criteria. Staff would establish a cost for the evaluation of the request and within 30 days would issue a written decision. If the staff decision were to deny the application, the applicant would have an option to appeal to the TSPC within 10 calendar days. This appeal would be scheduled for the next TSPC meeting. If they decide not to appeal, the process ends.

Mark Howard asked if the appeal time period is business days or calendar days. Steve Davis stated it should be calendar days. Tom Hamilton recommended making the applicant's appeal process timeline 15 calendar days. Steve Davis agreed.

Mark Howard confirmed the deadline dates would be listed in the application packet. Steve Davis stated it would.

Mark Howard asked about the field study costs; is this something that is going to be waived? Steve Davis responded that the applicant will pay the application fee and then if the request is approved for review, then the field study costs would be presented to the applicant. Mark Howard asked how this is established. Steve responded that the City Council has established hourly rates for staff time and staff would create an estimate based on this. Mark confirmed that the applicant would have 15 calendar days to pay the estimated field study fees and if this is not paid by the 15 calendar day deadline, they will have to start the application process again. Steve concurred.

Mark Howard confirmed staff and the TSPC will have 90 days to review the request and make a decision. Tom Hamilton agreed that this will give staff and the Committee a deadline for completion, but we can be flexible if the applicant wants to extend the time for some reason.

Mark Howard also confirmed if the applicant wants to appeal to the City Council, it should be 15 calendar days. Steve Davis stated it would be good to be consistent. Mark Howard stated there should be a time frame for adding an item to the agenda for the upcoming TSPC meeting. Steve Davis responded that if City staff has it by 5 pm one week before the meeting, it can be placed on the next

meeting's agenda. Mark Howard stated the wording could be "next available meeting's agenda" on the policy process outline.

Tom Hamilton asked if there should be another step for review of the request if it is denied by the TSPC and the applicant puts in an appeal to the City Council. Steve responded that if the request is denied by the TSPC, there should not be an appeal process to the City Council, so that step should be removed from the outline.

Mark Howard asked if there will be some flexibility with applicants regarding payment of fees if they go over the time limited response time. Steve responded that staff will work with any applicant that contacts the City and asks for an extension, but if they send in an application and are unresponsive past the time limit, they must reapply.

Steve Davis stated there is also a criteria that if the work requested is for the benefit of the general public, the requestor does not need to pay for the work. Doris Maez asked if the requestor is a school or a church, is that considered for the benefit of the general public?

Sol Weiner stated the applicant should be made aware that the parking restriction being requested is not for their sole use.

Doris Maez asked if there are design standards for curbside parking restrictions. Steve Davis stated it just defines the length of the space and a blue curb posted sign. There are not requirements for an ADA ramp.

Klara Fabry stated that if any location in the City does not meet the ADA requirements, there is a CIP program in place to assist with the expenses for compliance.

Doris Maez confirmed that the applicants will be paying \$247.00 as the application fee. Steve confirmed this. He stated the part of the purpose of the fee is to eliminate requests that are frivolous.

Doris Maez wanted to review the total timeline for an applicant. Mark Howard calculated there would be a maximum of 145 days, a minimum of 30 days. Klara Fabry said it should take under six months.

Steve Davis stated if the field study involves traffic counts or other work, it would take 30 days to order the work and get the results.

Eric Wood asked if this process is something that could be applied to other requests, such as stop signs. Steve Davis responded that once the process is set, it could be transferred to other requests. This fee was established for special parking requests due to the volume of these requests.

Eric Wood stated the wording "Special Parking Restriction" should be changed to "Parking Restriction" to avoid any applicant confusion.

Mark Howard asked the Committee members if there were any comments on the application form. Tom Hamilton stated the bottom of the application form should have some sort of statement near the signature line clarifying that the parking restriction being requested cannot be for the sole use of the requestor. Matt Campi clarified the request should state "for general public use". Klara Fabry clarified the next step after the Committee approves a final draft is a review by the City's legal department to make sure there are no conflicts with existing City ordinances.

Mark Howard recommended instead of the word "paint", use "install" on the bottom of the application.

Mark Howard recommended reviewing the Parking Policy Development Information attachment.

Blue Curb Handicapped Parking Zone Request:

Mark Howard recommended changing the wording under item 2, "City responsible for costs associated with establishment and maintenance of parking restriction" to "City may assume responsibility for costs associated with establishment and maintenance of parking restriction". Steve Davis agreed.

Under Item 3, Mark Howard recommended changing "If requested parking restriction benefits requesting party, then requesting party responsible for costs associated with establishment and maintenance of parking restriction" to "If the requested parking restriction primarily benefits the requesting party, then requesting party agrees to be responsible for the costs associated with establishment and maintenance of parking restriction."

Eric Wood commented under Item 4 that the specific description of 85% of existing parking capacity may need to be removed, since congestion could be worse at certain times of the day. Tom Hamilton recommended taking out the 85% wording.

Eric Wood asked if the Parking Policy Development Information sheet was going to be a public document. Klara Fabry confirmed this.

Mark Howard clarified if 85% of the parking is occupied, then that is considered congested. Doris Maez commented that distance and proximity, as well as which side of the street the request is being made on, should all be considered. Steve Davis stated parameters such as geographic boundaries and study times of the requested location are used as part of the decision. Steve stated he could include additional language in the description for the public's benefit.

Mark Howard stated one more bullet could cover defining peak hours, proximity of the effected area and existing congestion.

Doris Maez wanted to clarify that "abutting property" means the property on each side of the requested location. Steve confirmed this.

Doris Maez also wanted to clarify the term handicap parking – what does this mean? Steve Davis stated the wording could be clarified to state handicapped parking and accessible path of travel. Doris Maez agreed.

Time-Limited Parking Establishment of New, or Change in Existing Zone:

Evaluation should also consider associated impacts from change in parking time limit

Short Term Parking, i.e. Green Zone, Yellow Zone, or White Zone:

Mark Howard recommended placing a greater than sign in front of the 85% of existing parking occupied description. Steve agreed.

Doris Maez asked about the wording "prefer written concurrence from abutting property owners & tenants" and why there is a difference in wording elsewhere. Steve Davis stated long term parking is more of a parking area; short term parking is more isolated.

Eric Wood asked if this is needed in time limited parking. Steve responded that time limited parking is usually a whole geographic area. Eric recommended adding a specific consideration bullet regarding time limited parking being in a unique or isolated location. Steve concurred. Mark Howard commented that this should be covered under Item 3. Eric Wood recommended adding a sub-bullet under three to address this.

Steve Davis clarified that this parking policy will not preclude the City from maintaining parking resources in the way that will best serve the community.

Commander Campi stated the City would use the best practices to serve the public.

Eric Wood stated he just wanted to confirm that this policy will streamline parking requests for all uses, both commercial and residential. Steve Davis stated we may need to further define the term to exclude low density residential areas. Eric Wood stated the wording could be changed to include only commercial land use.

Tom Hamilton stated his concern is that applicants will pay the fee and be immediately rejected. Mark Howard stated this fee covers the cost of residents asking the City for requests that must be evaluated and may be rejected, but it will eliminate the obviously ridiculous requests. Tom Hamilton felt the documents should clearly state what is considered and what is not.

Klara Fabry commented that this policy is to give us a guideline for the process but it cannot cover every request.

Sol Weiner stated there are streets in San Bruno right now that have no restrictions and should have them. Neighborhoods are getting bombarded with parking problems and there should be a process for no commercial use in residential areas.

Mark Howard stated eventually the parking around the Caltrain station will have to be addressed, as those residents are going to be strongly affected by the development in that area.

Eric Wood asked if the intention with this policy is to only handle commercial requests and allow the residential requests to go through the regular channels. Steve Davis responded spill over parking that impacts neighborhoods should be handled at a City level, but not at this parking policy level. The goal is to establish some criteria to be able to exclude the applicants that do not meet the policy requirements. The City does currently have a very narrow permit parking policy in use.

Klara Fabry stated after implementation of this policy, the policy can be changed or modified as needed. Mark Howard asked if the modifications need to be approved by the Council. Klara confirmed the Council would need to approve this.

Red Curb No Parking Zone (Sight Distance Concern):

Tom Hamilton stated the description is perfect.

Mark Howard asked if a bullet could be included regarding driveway widening as an option to installing red curbing adjacent to their driveway. Steve Davis stated he would include this.

Tall/Large Vehicle No Parking Zone:

Mark Howard asked if this is covered in the City ordinance. Steve Davis responded the City does not currently differentiate based on vehicle size. The vehicle code and there is a City ordinance on width and length that prevents parking in certain areas.

Mark Howard recommended putting the City ordinance as a bullet under this item as a reference to applicants to see if their problem could be addressed through enforcement.

Klara Fabry commented that large vehicle issues have come before the Council before so may be this is a valuable item to review with the Council.

Eric Wood asked if the current requests have had this policy applied to them. Steve Davis responded they have not. He was planning on applying the final draft to the items. Some of the requests have had some work performed and others are new. For the next meeting, the current outstanding requests can be evaluated based on the final draft.

Eric Wood asked how many requests are outstanding. Steve responded there are about 15. The challenge is that some of the parking requests require studies to give an accurate assessment.

Klara Fabry asked what the last approved limited parking issue was? Steve Davis stated the last approved item by the TSPC was the limited parking recommendation on Commodore Drive.

Mark Howard recommended numbering the policy steps and apply that to the outstanding 15 requests then that would give the Committee an idea where they are in the parking policy process. Klara Fabry stated that is a reasonable recommendation. That will also give the City's legal department time to review the policy. Mark Howard stated it would be great to review either at the next meeting or February's meeting.

Mark Howard recommended changing the wording to "primarily" from "only" in the policy description.

Tom Hamilton recommended voicing an intention to review the policy in 18 months when it is presented to the Council. Klara concurred and also asked if some members of the Committee could be present to support the presentation to the Council.

Mark Howard made a motion to accept the final parking policy draft with the recommended edits. Second by Eric Wood. (M/Howard, S/Wood): 5-0-0 - Approved.

## **6. REPORT OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

Doris Maez, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee representative, did not have an update.

## **7. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Sol Weiner stated he would like to compliment the City staff for all their hard work. It has been a pleasure to work with everyone.

Doris Maez stated that on southbound Rollingwood at the Sneath Lane intersection, turning and direction lane markings are not clearly visible. They need to be refreshed. Klara Fabry stated the striping is in bad shape due to budget cuts, but hopefully funding will come through and this will be re-done.

Eric Wood stated the annual presentation to the City Council went well. He wanted to know if there is a way to pinpoint outstanding issues in the City and take an active role and start making changes before

they come before the TSPC or do we have to wait until an issue is put before the Committee. Steve Davis stated the Committee can bring issues up, but there is also a hope that there will be a new staff member that will focus on traffic issues in the City.

Klara Fabry also stated that the City's goal is to be more proactive, but the Department's commitment is to address and implement the backlog of issues first. This policy is a first step to assist with this. The assumption is that it will take us about 1 year to address these past issues.

## **8. COMMENTS FROM STAFF**

Commander Campi stated on behalf of the Police Chief and the Police staff, we all want to recognize and thank Sol for his commitment and service, from all the current officers to all officers from the past.

Mark Howard asked about the traffic cameras. Commander Campi stated they are very close to finalizing the contract with the vendor and then staff will begin to look at intersections to implement the program.

Mark Howard recommended asking about red clearance design when it goes before Caltrans for reprogramming upgrades, primarily at Sneath and El Camino Real. This simply means everyone has a red light for a brief moment to create safe clearance. This problem has created a large number of right of way accidents.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: To adjourn the Traffic Safety and Parking Committee (TSPC) meeting until it's next regular scheduled meeting on January 6, 2010 at 7 p.m.

(M/Weiner, S/Howard): 5-0-0 - Approved. Meeting Adjourned, 9:00 pm.